



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/809,172	03/25/2004	Timothy S. Pack	MS307451.1/MSFTP607US	6811
27195	7590	11/17/2008		
AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP			EXAMINER	
127 Public Square			LOVEL, KIMBERLY M	
57th Floor, Key Tower				
CLEVELAND, OH 44114			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2167	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/17/2008	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docket1@thepatentattorneys.com  
hholmes@thepatentattorneys.com  
lpasterchek@thepatentattorneys.com



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/809,172  
Filing Date: March 25, 2004  
Appellant(s): PAEK ET AL.

Himanshu S. Amin, Reg. # 40,894  
For Appellant

**EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 6 August 2008 appealing from the Office action mailed 15 February 2008.

**(1) Real Party in Interest**

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

**(2) Related Appeals and Interferences**

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

**(3) Status of Claims**

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

**(4) Status of Amendments After Final**

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

**(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter**

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

**(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal**

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

**NEW GROUND(S) OF REJECTION**

A claim objection has been inserted for claim 19 since the claim is an improper dependent claim.

**(7) Claims Appendix**

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

**(8) Evidence Relied Upon**

Roberts, Jonathan C. and Edward Suvanaphen. "Visual Bracketing for Web search Result Visualization." Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference on Information Visualization (IV'03). IEEE: 2003.

Pook, Stuart, Eric Lecolinet, Guy Vaysseix and Emmanuel Barillot. "Context and Interaction in Zoomable User Interfaces." AVI 2000: Palarmo, Italy. ACM: 2000.

2007/0156677

SZABO

7-2007

### **(9) Grounds of Rejection**

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

#### ***35 USC § 101 - Clarifications***

Claim 20 is directed towards a computer-implemented system which comprises a processor and means for performing a plurality of processes. The processor is considered to represent the hardware necessary to place the claimed system within the statutory category of a system (Appellant's Specification: see page 15, lines 1-7).

#### ***Claim Objections***

Claim 19 is objected to because of the following informalities:

The claim language of dependent claim 19 conflicts with that of independent claim 1. Claim 1 states that the interface which comprises a lens component and a layout component is stored on a computer-readable storage medium. First of all, according to claim 19, it appears that the computer-readable storage medium has been converted to a computer-readable medium. Furthermore, claim 19 appears to be directed to subject that matter that has been incorporated into claim 1 and therefore is not considered to further limit the scope of claim 1.

Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claims 1-12, 15-17 and 19-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the article “Visual Bracketing for Web Search Result Visualization” to Roberts et al (hereafter Roberts) in view of the article “Context Interaction in Zoomable User Interfaces” to Pook et al (hereafter Pook).**

Referring to claim 1, Roberts discloses a computer-implemented interface for data presentation embodied on a computer-readable storage medium, comprising:

a lens component [focus window] associated with a portion of a user interface display, the lens component defines an area to display information from at least one search result [SRE] (see Section 2.1, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph and 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph; Section 3, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph and third paragraph; and Fig 1); and

include additional textual information that is selected from the at least one search result for insertion into the detailed subset of information based in part on a query associated with the at least one search result [one result is shown in full detail], as compared to the amount of information displayed for the at least one search result when

outside of the area defined by the lens component (see Section 3, 5<sup>th</sup> paragraph; and Section 4.1, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph); and

Roberts fails to explicitly disclose the limitation of a layout component that displays a detailed subset of information, comprising textual information, within the area defined by the lens component based upon the search result, the detailed subset of information is animated to enlarge in size as compared to the amount of information associated with the at least one other search result displayed outside the lens region. Pook discloses zoomable user interfaces with control menus, including the further limitation of a layout component that displays a detailed subset of information, comprising textual information, within the area defined by the lens component based upon the search result, the detailed subset of information is animated to enlarge in size as compared to the amount of information associated with the at least one other search result displayed outside the lens region [semantic zooming] (see Section 1, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph and Section 5.1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the control menu of Pook with the focus window of Roberts. One would have been motivated to do so in order to increase the ability of a user to effectively browse through search results (Roberts: see abstract).

**Referring to claim 2**, the combination of Roberts and Pook (hereafter Roberts/Pook) discloses the interface of claim 1, further comprising at least one search engine [Google web service] and at least one local or remote database [web] to retrieve

the search result (Roberts: see Section 2, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph and Section 4.1, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph, lines 1-4).

**Referring to claim 3**, Roberts/Pook discloses the interface of claim 1, the layout component [control menu] receives user inputs that operates, alters, or selects display criteria of the lens component and other search results (Pook: see Section 5.1).

**Referring to claim 4**, Roberts/Pook discloses the interface of claim 3, further comprising one or more parameters [zoom] that effect the display criteria (Pook: see Section 1, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph; and Section 5.2).

**Referring to claim 6**, Roberts/Pook discloses the interface of claim 4, the parameters include at least one of a lens size, a lens shape, a lens location, a magnification factor, a presentation rate, a delay, a trigger, or a minimum font size [zoom, dezoom, scroll, create magic lenses, move and resize magic lenses and move and scroll portals] (Pook: see Section 1, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph).

**Referring to claim 5**, Roberts/Pook discloses the interface of claim 1, further comprising at least one other lens component to display information (Roberts: see Section 4.2).

**Referring to claim 7**, Roberts/Pook discloses the interface of claim 1, the lens component is defined as a fisheye lens that is applied vertically to a display at about a focal center of the display (Roberts: see Section 2.1, 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph).

**Referring to claim 8**, Roberts/Pook discloses the interface of claim 7, the focal center includes one result item [one result shown in full detail] comprising a title [title],

description [paragraph of text], and URL [URL] of a web page (Roberts: see Section 2.1, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph, lines 3-5 and 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph; and Section 4.1, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph).

**Referring to claim 9**, Roberts/Pook discloses the interface of claim 7, the fisheye lens is associated with a piecewise view (Roberts: see Section 2.1, 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph).

**Referring to claim 10**, Roberts/Pook discloses the interface of claim 1, further comprising a display option for controlling a rate of magnification for the lens component by using a factor as a target and incrementally adjusting a zoom until the target is reached (Pook: see Section 1, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph; Section 5; and Section 5.1).

**Referring to claim 11**, Roberts/Pook discloses the interface of claim 10, the detailed subset of information displayed within the area defined by the lens component increases in size until a maximum size is reached (Pook: see Section 1, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph; Section 5; and Section 5.1).

**Referring to claim 12**, Roberts/Pook discloses the interface of claim 10, further comprising a parameter that controls a size of zoom increments (Pook: see Section 1, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph; Section 5; and Section 5.1).

**Referring to claim 15**, Roberts/Pook discloses the interface of claim 12, further comprising a content insertion parameter that is adjusted according to a rate of insertion or according to a size of information chunks (Pook: see Section 1, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph; Section 5; and Section 5.1).

**Referring to claim 16**, Roberts/Pook discloses the interface of claim 1, further comprising a control panel [control menu] to allow designers to adjust display parameters for the lens component or the layout component (Pook: see Section 5.1).

**Referring to claim 17**, Roberts/Pook discloses the interface of claim 1, further comprising a display output associated with at least one of an instant information view or a dynamic information view (Pook: see Section 1).

**Referring to claim 19**, Roberts/Pook fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation of a computer readable medium. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize a computer readable medium having computer readable instructions stored thereon for implementing the components of claim 1 with Roberts/Pook. One would have been motivated to do so since the concept of storing instructions on a computer readable medium for execution is well known to one of ordinary skill in the art.

**Referring to claim 20**, Roberts discloses a method for automatic search result organization, comprising:

means for retrieving search results [Google API] from a database [web], each search result [SRE] of the search results comprising textual information associated with the respective search result [URLs and SRE: contains nine variable concerning one url that matches the keyword search], the content comprising subsets of the content where each subset is associated with a content type [i.e., title, URL, paragraph of text] (see Section 2.1, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph);

means for processing the search results in accordance with a lens [focus window] (see Section 3, 6<sup>th</sup> paragraph; Section 3.1; and Fig 3);

means for displaying at least one search result from within the lens [SRE] and other search results outside the lens [URL] (see Section 3.1; Fig 3; and Section 4.1);  
and

means for inserting additional textual information associated with the at least one search result within the lens [focus window] as compared to other search results outside the lens, the additional textual information is selected from the at least one search result for insertion within the lens based in part on a query associated with the at least one search result [one result is shown in full detail] (see Section 3, 5<sup>th</sup> paragraph; and Section 4.1, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph); and

Roberts fails to explicitly disclose the limitation of means for animating the at least one of the search results displayed within the lens to magnify it in size as compared to other search results outside the lens. Pook discloses zoomable user interfaces with control menus, including the further limitation of means for animating the at least one of the search results displayed within the lens to magnify it in size as compared to other search results outside the lens [semantic zooming] (see Section 1, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the control menu of Pook with the focus window of Roberts. One would have been motivated to do so in order to increase the ability of a user to effectively browse through search results (Roberts: see abstract).

Roberts/Pook fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation of a processor. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize a processor with Roberts/Pook. One would have been motivated to do so since the concept of including a processor within a computer system is well known to one of ordinary skill in the art.

**Referring to claim 21**, Roberts discloses a method for automatic search result organization, comprising:

defining a lens region [focus window] to display at least one of the search results (see Section 3, 6<sup>th</sup> paragraph; Section 3.1; and Fig 3);

displaying at least one of the search results within the lens region [SRE] and at least one other search result outside the lens region [URL] (see Section 3.1; Fig 3; and Section 4.1);

inserting additional content associated with the at least one of the search results within the lens region [focus window], the additional content is selected from the at least one of the search results for insertion within the lens region based in part on a query associated with the at least one of the search results [one result is shown in full detail] (see Section 3, 5<sup>th</sup> paragraph; and Section 4.1, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph); and

While Roberts discloses the further limitations of displaying search results, each search result [SRE] comprised of content associated with the respective search result [contains nine variable concerning one url that matches the keyword search], the content comprising subsets of the content where each subset is associated with a content type [i.e., title, URL, paragraph of text] (see Section 2.1, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph), Roberts

fails to explicitly disclose defining a plurality of parameters for displaying search results. Also, Roberts fails to explicitly disclose the limitation of animating the content associated with the at least one of the search results displayed within the lens region to enlarge the size of the content as compared to content associated with the at least one other search result displayed outside the lens region. Pook discloses zoomable user interfaces with control menus, including the further limitations of defining a plurality of parameters for displaying search results [control menu] (see Section 5.1) and animating the content associated with the at least one of the search results displayed within the lens region to enlarge the size of the content as compared to content associated with the at least one other search result displayed outside the lens region [semantic zooming] (see Section 1, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the control menu of Pook with the focus window of Roberts. One would have been motivated to do so in order to increase the ability of a user to effectively browse through search results (Roberts: see abstract).

**Referring to claim 22**, Roberts/Pook discloses the method of claim 21, the parameters include at least one of a lens size, a lens shape, a lens location, a magnification factor, a viewing rate, a delay, a trigger, or a minimum font size [zoom, dezoom, scroll, create magic lenses, move and resize magic lenses and move and scroll portals] (Pook: see Section 1, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph).

**Referring to claim 23**, Roberts/Pook discloses the method of claim 22, further comprising providing a focal center for the lens region [focus on a region] (Pook: see Section 2, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph).

**Referring to claim 24**, Roberts/Pook discloses the method of claim 23, further comprising controlling a rate of magnification associated with the lens region by using a factor as a target and incrementally adjusting a zoom until the target is reached (Pook: see Section 1, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph; and Section 5.2).

**Referring to claim 25**, Roberts discloses a method for automatic search result organization, comprising:

one or more data items and results respectively associated therewith retrieved from a database [web], each of the one or more data items comprising text associated with a respective result [SRE's] (see Section 2.1; and Section 4.1, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph);

one or more display objects created for the one or more data items (see Fig 3);

a lens component [focus window] to present at least one of the one or more display objects in a different format with respect to a collection of the one or more display objects (see Section 3, 6<sup>th</sup> paragraph; Section 3.1; Fig 3; Section 4.1) to modify that display object to include additional text that is retrieved from a result to be included in the display object based in part on a query associated with the result, as compared to display objects outside of the lens component [one result is shown in full detail] (see Section 3, 5<sup>th</sup> paragraph; and Section 4.1, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph).

Roberts fails to explicitly disclose the limitations of an input component for selecting the one or more data items and parameters respectively associated with each

of the one or more data items and animation of the at least one of the one or more display objects to magnify that display object in size and modify that display object to include additional text that is retrieved from a result to be included in the display object based in part on a associated with a respective the result, as compared to display objects outside of the lens component. Pook discloses zoomable user interfaces with control menus, including the further limitations of an input component [control menu] for selecting the one or more data items and parameters respectively associated with each of the one or more data item (see Section 5.1) and animation of the at least one of the one or more display objects to magnify that display object in size and modify that display object to include additional text that is retrieved from a result to be included in the display object based in part on a associated with a respective the result, as compared to display objects outside of the lens component [semantic zooming] (see Section 1, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the control menu of Pook with the focus window of Roberts. One would have been motivated to do so in order to increase the ability of a user to effectively browse through search results (Roberts: see abstract).

**Referring to claim 26**, Roberts/Pook discloses the interface of claim 25, further comprising controls [control menu] for interacting with a search engine, a database, the one or more display objects, or the lens component (see Section 5.1).

**Referring to claim 27**, Roberts/Pook discloses the interface of claim 25, the one or more display objects are associated with at least one of text insertion, query-relevant

text insertion, thumbnails of a web page, information about a size of a result, a download speed, or a recency of a page (Roberts: see Section 2.1).

**Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the article “Visual Bracketing for Web Search Result Visualization” to Roberts et al in view of the article “Context Interaction in Zoomable User Interfaces” to Pook et al as applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of US PGPub 2004/0030741 to Wolton et al (hereafter Wolton et al).**

Referring to claim 13, Roberts/Pook discloses zoom increments. However, Roberts/Pook fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation wherein the zoom increments are controlled with a step function. Wolton et al disclose zoom increments, including the further limitation wherein the zoom increments are controlled with a step function (see [00561], lines 3-9) in order to provide the user-friendly interface.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to use the feature of using steps to define the increments as disclosed by Wolton et al with the display of Roberts/Pook. One would have been motivated to do so in order to provide the a user-friendly interface.

**Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the article “Visual Bracketing for Web Search Result Visualization” to Roberts et al in view of the article “Context Interaction in Zoomable User Interfaces” to Pook et al as applied respectively to claim 12 above, and further in view of US PGPub 2005/0168488 to Montague (hereafter Montague).**

Referring to claim 14, Roberts/Pook discloses a displaying content. However, Roberts/Pook fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation of geometric or exponential functions that allow data to grow or settle at varying acceleration. Montague discloses displaying information (see abstract) including the further limitation of geometric or exponential functions that allow the detailed subset of information to grow or settle at varying acceleration (see [0054]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to use the feature of geometric functions as disclosed by Montague with the display of Roberts/Pook. One would have been motivated to do so in order to provide the a user-friendly interface that can display different types of information.

**Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the article “Visual Bracketing for Web Search Result Visualization” to Roberts et al in view of the article “Context Interaction in Zoomable User Interfaces” to Pook et al as applied respectively to claim 17 above, and further in view of US PGPub 2007/0156677 to Szabo (hereafter Szabo).**

Referring to claim 18, while Roberts/Pook discloses wherein the dynamic view is coordinated with an amount of information to progressively insert (Pook: see Section 1, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph) additional information associated with at least one search result into the detailed subset of information (Roberts: see Section 4.1, 1st paragraph), Roberts/Pook fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation where the detail changes according to an amount of time a mouse hovers over the at least one search result. Szabo discloses a user computer interface system including the further limitation where the detail changes according to an amount of time a mouse hovers over the at least one search result (see [0349] and [0359]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the technique of hovering as disclosed by Szabo to replace the technique of pointing disclosed by Roberts/Pook. One would have been motivated to do so since both art provide a mouse and the act of hovering instead of clicking requires one less step by the user.

**(10) Response to Argument**

This Examiner's Answer will address the Appellant's arguments in the order in which they appear in the appeal brief.

- **Issue A: The Rejection of Claims 1-12, 15-17 and 19-27 under 35 USC § 103(a)**

**Appellant's Arguments:** In particular, independent claim 1, as amended, recites: a layout component that displays a detailed subset of information, comprising textual information, within the area defined by the lens component based upon the search result, the detailed subset of information is animated to enlarge in size and to include additional textual information that is selected from the at least one search result for insertion into the detailed subset of information based in part on a query associated with the at least one search result, as compared to the amount of information displayed for the at least one search result when outside of the area defined by the lens component. Roberts et al. and Pook et al., either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest this distinctive aspect of the claimed subject matter.

Rather, Roberts et al. relates to a visual bracketing method that provides detail-in-context views where the inner part contains the Focus bracketed by the context information at a lower semantic level. (See Abstract.) Roberts et al. teaches a visual bracketing effect by displaying different semantic information in fore and after visualizations. (See § 2.2.) Roberts et al. further teaches an inner part that contains the

detail view while the bracketed visualizations contain the context information at a lower level of detail. (See id.) However, unlike the claimed subject matter, Roberts et al. fails to teach displaying a detailed subset of information, including textual information, in the lens component based upon the search result, where the detailed subset of information is animated to enlarge in size and to *include additional textual information that is selected from the at least one search result for insertion into the detailed subset of information based in part on a query* associated with the at least one search result (Appeal Brief: pages 6-7).

**Examiner's Response:** The Examiner respectfully disagrees that Roberts et al fails to teach the portion of the claimed limitation that states *additional textual information that is selected from the at least one search result for insertion into the detailed subset of information based in part on a query*. The examiner cited that Section 3, 5th paragraph and Section 4.1, 1st paragraph of Roberts teaches this limitation. The 5th paragraph of Section 3 states "A sliding window methodology is also applied to the design, such that the user may directly slide the focus view up and down to change the information that is displayed in the center (and corresponding bracketed) views. This acts in a similar way to a fish-eye view where the center window displays the full resolution and a lower level of detail is shown either side ...." The 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph of Section 4.1 states "Figure 4 shows a screen shot of this realization. After the user types and submits a query to the Google web service a set of results are visualized according to our bracketing concept. One result is shown in full detail (focus view), the

next n (in this case 5) are displayed either side as URL's and the remaining results are displayed as greeked lines. The user can scroll up and down to alter the focus information, or merely click on any result (Greeked or URL) and the result will become the new focus view; the rest of the visualization rearranges itself accordingly ...." When the user receives the search results (a list of SREs), the user can alter the location of the focus view. A result that is not located in the focus view may either currently be represented as greeked lines or URLs whereas a result located in the focus view is represented as a SRE with full information. The 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph of Section 2.1 of Roberts states "One SRE contains nine variables concerning one url that matches the keyword search. In this work we focus on four main variables (title, URL, paragraph of text and page size). We use a model-view-controller design-pattern in our implementation, and thus store each of the SRE's in a list that can be visualized on demand." The examiner interprets the information inside the focus view as representing the detailed subset of information. Before the sliding window is placed on the SRE it is represented by an URL or a greeked line and afterwards it is represented as an SRE contain full information. The full detail contains additional information such as title, paragraph of text, page size, etc. The examiner interprets the additional information such as the paragraph of text as being analogous to the claimed "additional textual information." The additional information (title, paragraph of text, page size, etc.) is dependent on the SRE that is located in the sliding window. Therefore, Roberts is considered to meet the claimed phrase "that is selected from the at least one search result." This additional information is now present in the focus view which as mentioned previously is

considered to represent the detailed subset of information. The last portion of the limitation states “based in part on a query associated with the at least one search result.” Since the user enters a query into Google's API, the results are considered to be dependent upon the query. It is well-known to one of ordinary skill in the art that Google provides snippets [paragraphs of text] for a search result, wherein the snippets emphasize query terms through highlighting.

**Appellant's Arguments:** Further, Pook et al. fails to cure the deficiencies of Roberts et al. with regard to the claimed subject matter. Pook et al. relates to zoomable user interfaces. (See p. 143, § 5.) Pook et al. teaches that users change the scale of their view of the information space depending on the level of detail that they want to see at a given moment. (See p. 115, § 4.4.) Pook et al. also teaches semantic zooming where, as a user zooms on an object, the object grows until it vanishes and is replaced by other objects that represent the same underlying information but in more detail. (See id.) However, unlike the claimed subject matter, Pook et al. fails to teach animating a subset of information to enlarge in size and to include additional textual information that is selected from a search result for insertion into the subset of information based in part on a query associated with the at least one search result. Instead, Pook et al. teaches that static portals can be used in semantic zooming (See pp. 115-116, § 4.4.1.) (Appeal Brief: page 7).

**Examiner's Response:** The Examiner utilized Pook et al to disclose the concept of animating the detailed subset of information to enlarge in size. The Examiner respectfully disagrees that Pook et al fails to teach this concept. The examiner cited the 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph of Section 1.1 and Section 5.1 of Pook et al as teaching this limitation. The 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph of Section 1.1 states "... When using a ZUI, the users are presented with a view of an information space. The initial (or top level) view shows the entire information space at a scale which allows it to fit on the users' screen. The users can then zoom (or enlarge) a section of the view that they find interesting. The graphical objects will get bigger until, as soon as there is enough space on the screen, they are replaced by other graphical objects showing the underlying information in more detail. This is called semantic zooming. ...." The examiner considers the section of the view as taught by Pook et al to represent the claimed detailed subset of information and the enlarging of a section as taught by Pook et al to represent the claimed phrase of "enlarge in size." The concept of the objects enlarging in size until there is enough room on the screen and then being replaced as taught by Pook et al is considered to represent the claimed concept of animation. Therefore, since the claim language is given the broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the specification without reading limitations from the specification into the claim language, Pook et al is considered to meet the requirements of the limitation for the reasons stated above.

**Appellant's Arguments:** Independent claim 21 (and similarly independent claim 20) recites: inserting additional content associated with the at least one of the search results within the lens region, the additional content is selected from the at least one of the search results for insertion within the lens region based in part on a query associated with the at least one of the search results. Roberts et al. and Pook et al., either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest this distinctive aspect of the claimed subject matter. For at least reasons similar to the reasons stated herein with regard to independent claim 1, Roberts et al. and Pook et al., either alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest the distinctive aspects of the claimed subject matter. For instance, Roberts et al. and Pook et al. fail to teach selecting additional content associated with a search result for insertion within a lens region of an interface based in part on the query associated with the search result, when the search result is displayed within the lens region (Appeal Brief: pages 8-9).

**Examiner's Response:** The examiner respectfully disagrees that the combination of Roberts et al and Pook et al fails to disclose the claimed limitation for the reasons stated above in regards to claim 1.

**Appellant's Arguments:** Independent claim 25 recites: a lens component to present at least one of the one or more display objects in a different format with respect to a collection of the one or more data items, the different format comprises animation of the at least one of the one or more display objects to magnify that display object in size and modify that display object to include additional text that is retrieved from a result to be included in the display object based in part on a query associated with the result, as compared to display objects outside of the lens component. For at least reasons similar to the reasons stated herein with regard to independent claim 1, Roberts et al. and Pook et al., either alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest this distinctive feature of the claimed subject matter (Appeal Brief: page 9).

**Examiner's Response:** The examiner respectfully disagrees that the combination of Roberts et al and Pook et al fails to disclose the claimed limitation for the reasons stated above in regards to claim 1.

- **Issue B: The Rejection of Claim 13 under 35 USC § 103(a)**

**Appellant's Arguments:** Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roberts et al. in view of Pook et al. and further in view of Wolton et al. (US Pub. No. 2004/0030741) (hereinafter "Wolton et al."). It is requested that this rejection be reversed for at least the following reason. Roberts et al., Pook et al., and Wolton et al., either alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest each and every element of the claimed subject matter. Claim 13 depends from independent claim 1. Wolton et al. fails to cure the aforementioned deficiencies of Roberts et al. and Pook et al. with respect to independent claim 1. Rather, Wolton et al. relates to a tool for creating intelligent information management applications in the form of specialized search and retrieval agents (See p. 3, ¶ [0048].) (Appeal Brief: pages 9-10).

**Examiner's Response:** For the reasons stated above in regards to claim 1, the combination of Roberts et al and Pook et al discloses, teaches or suggests each every element of the claimed subject matter. Therefore, the rejection of claim 13 as being unpatentable over Roberts et al in view of Pook et al and further in view of Wolton et al is also maintained.

- **Issue C: The Rejection of Claim 14 under 35 USC § 103(a)**

**Appellant's Arguments:** Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roberts et al. in view of Pook et al. and further in view of Montague (US Pub. No. 2005/0168488) (hereinafter "Montague"). It is requested that this rejection be reversed for at least the following reason. Roberts et al., Pook et al., and Montague, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest each and every element of the claimed subject matter. Claim 14 depends from independent claim 1. Montague fails to cure the aforementioned deficiencies of Roberts et al. and Pook et al. with respect to independent claim 1. Rather, Montague relates to methods of combining user interfaces, such as zooming in/out, panning, rotating, drawing, selecting, and manipulating during a drag by a mouse for a graphics display (See p. 1, ¶ [0004].) (Appeal Brief: page 10).

**Examiner's Response:** For the reasons stated above in regards to claim 1, the combination of Roberts et al and Pook et al discloses, teaches or suggests each every element of the claimed subject matter. Therefore, the rejection of claim 14 as being unpatentable over Roberts et al in view of Pook et al and further in view of Montague is also maintained.

- **Issue D: The Rejection of Claim 18 under 35 USC § 103(a)**

**Appellant's Arguments:** Further, Claim 18 additionally recites: the dynamic information view is coordinated with an amount of information to progressively insert additional information associated with the at least one search result into the detailed subset of information according to an amount of time a mouse hovers over the at least one search result. Roberts et al., Pook et al., and Szabo, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest this distinctive functionality of the claimed subject matter.

The Examiner states that Roberts et al. and Pook et al. fail to teach the claimed subject matter as recited in claim 18. (See Office Action dated February 15, 2008, p. 14, ¶ 9.) Further, Szabo fails to teach the distinctive functionality as recited in claim 18. Rather, Szabo relates to a user interface wherein the user may "hover", or hold a graphic cursor near a screen object, to trigger a change in display rather than requiring a mouse click. (See p. 41, ¶ [0349].) However, Szabo fails to teach progressively inserting additional information associated with a search result into the detailed subset of information according to an amount of time a mouse hovers over the search result. Instead, Szabo teaches that while hovering, the user can increase the detail to see siblings, parents, and dependents related to taxonomic categories. (See p. 41, ¶¶ [0345]-[0350].) Szabo does not teach progressively inserting additional information related to a search result nor does Szabo teach progressive insertion of additional information based on the amount of time the mouse hovers over a search result.

Conversely, the claimed subject matter can progressively insert information related to a search result in a detailed subset of information, when the search result is displayed in an area within the lens component, based in part on the amount of time a mouse hovers over the search result. (See Figs. 4 and 5; p. 9, Ins. 24-26; p. 3, Ins. 3-5.) For example, the longer the mouse hovers over the search result in the lens component area, the more information related to the search result is inserted into the detailed subset of information related to the search result (Appeal Brief: pages 10-11).

**Examiner's Response:** The examiner respectfully disagrees that the combination of Roberts et al, Pook et al and Szabo fails to teach this limitation. The combination of Roberts et al and Pook et al were utilized to teach the portion of the limitation that states "progressively insert additional information associated with at least one search result into the detailed subset of information." Paragraphs [0349] and [0359] of Szabo were utilized to disclose the further limitation where the detail changes according to an amount of time a mouse hovers over the at least one search result. The cited paragraphs state "According to an aspect of the present invention, the user may hover, or hold the graphic cursor near a screen object, to trigger a change in display, such as a change in local detail, rather than requiring a mouse click or other discrete event. With such hovering, the user can increase displayed detail ...." While the user is hovering near the object, additional detail is being inserted. When user stops hovering, additional information is no longer inserted. Therefore, since information is only inserted while the user is hovering, this is considered to be

analogous to the concept of changing the details based upon the amount of time the user hovers.

**(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix**

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

This examiner's answer contains a new ground of rejection set forth in section (9) above. Accordingly, appellant must within **TWO MONTHS** from the date of this answer exercise one of the following two options to avoid *sua sponte* dismissal of the appeal as to the claims subject to the new ground of rejection:

(1) **Reopen prosecution.** Request that prosecution be reopened before the primary examiner by filing a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 with or without amendment, affidavit or other evidence. Any amendment, affidavit or other evidence must be relevant to the new grounds of rejection. A request that complies with 37 CFR 41.39(b)(1) will be entered and considered. Any request that prosecution be reopened will be treated as a request to withdraw the appeal.

(2) **Maintain appeal.** Request that the appeal be maintained by filing a reply brief as set forth in 37 CFR 41.41. Such a reply brief must address each new ground of rejection as set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(vii) and should be in compliance with the other requirements of 37 CFR 41.37(c). If a reply brief filed pursuant to 37 CFR 41.39(b)(2) is accompanied by any amendment, affidavit or other evidence, it shall be treated as a request that prosecution be reopened before the primary examiner under 37 CFR 41.39(b)(1).

Extensions of time under 37 CFR 1.136(a) are not applicable to the TWO MONTH time period set forth above. See 37 CFR 1.136(b) for extensions of time to reply for patent applications and 37 CFR 1.550(c) for extensions of time to reply for ex parte reexamination proceedings.

Respectfully submitted,

/Kimberly Lovel/

Kimberly Lovel  
Examiner  
AU 2167

Conferees:

/John R. Cottingham/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2167

John Cottingham  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
AU 2167

/Tony Mahmoudi/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2169

Tony Mahmoudi  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
AU 2169